The University of Chicago

THE GRAMMATICAL WRITINGS OF WILLIAM LILY, ?1468-?1523

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1939

By

VINCENT JOSEPH FLYNN

[Separate from the PAPERS of the Bibliographical Society of America]

Volume Thirty-seven, Second Quarter, 1943

COPYRIGHT, 1943, THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

The University of Chicago

THE GRAMMATICAL WRITINGS OF WILLIAM LILY, ?1468-?1523

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1939

By

VINCENT JOSEPH FLYNN

[Separate from the PAPERS of the Bibliographical Society of America]

Volume Thirty-seven, Second Quarter, 1943

COPYRIGHT, 1943, THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

R. UNIV
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

The Grammatical Writings of William Lily, ?1468-?1523*

By VINCENT JOSEPH FLYNN

THERE has long existed, and there still exists to-day, considerable confusion about the grammatical writings of William Lily. Vague and conflicting statements on the subject appear in biographical accounts of the author, and in different studies of the period which make occasional reference to him. In this paper I have set out to clear up this confusion: to determine precisely what Lily wrote, to describe each item with some fullness, to sketch the history and indicate the importance of each, and, finally, to treat in greater detail the compilation that passed under Lily's name for over three hundred years.

It is this last named work which is most commonly meant when one speaks of "Lily's Grammar." But we often find the term applied to one or another of Lily's separate publications—hence the confusion and contradictions. First of all, people sometimes speak of "Lily's Grammar" when they mean an accidence by John Colet and a syntax by Lily, both in English, published together in one small volume, the text later taken up by Cardinal Wolsey. More often they have in mind a short but pithy syntax in Latin written by Lily and revised by Erasmus—a book which

* This paper is the "essential portion" of the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, 1939, *The Life and Works of William Lily*.

had an enormous vogue, especially on the Continent, for three-quarters of a century. Occasionally they seem to mean a set of Latin verses by Lily on the rules for the gender of nouns and the conjugation of verbs. These three treatises were used after Lily's death in putting together what became popularly known as "Lily's Grammar." I shall describe each of the four in order.

Colet's Aeditio and Lily's Rudimenta Grammatices

This was apparently the first of the series; the earliest known edition is that of 1527, but Colet's part bears a letter of dedication to Lily, dated in some editions 1509[1] and in others 1510.[2]

Cardinal Gasquet has described a manuscript schoolbook coming from the cloister school of Canterbury in the latter half of the fifteenth century; it was handed down from one generation of schoolboys to another, and was possibly used by young Reginald Pole long before he thought of busying himself with the affairs of the mighty. The codex contains a dictionary, and the *Grecismus* of Evrard de Bethune;[3] but it likewise includes prayers, religious instruction, and rules for the manners and daily life of a monk.[4] Colet's grammar follows in the same tradition; correct Latin is dear to the Dean's heart, but good manners and good morals are dearer. First of all come the articles of admission to

[1] For example, in the edition of Peter Treveris, London, 1529, and that of Martin Caesar, Antwerp, 1535, both in the form known as "Wolsey's Grammar" (see below, pp. 95-98). A copy of each is in the British Museum.

[2] For example, in the edition of Wynkyn de Worde, 1534, a copy of which is in the British Museum; and in the edition of 1527 (*s. l. et typ.*), represented by the unique copy in the library of Peterborough Cathedral. This last has been reprinted in Samuel Blach. *Shakespeares Lateingrammatik, Lilys Grammatica Latina nach der ältesten bekannten Ausgabe von 1527 und für Shakespeare in Betracht kommenden Ausgabe von 1566* (*London, R. Wolfius*). In: *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, 1908, pp. 65-177; XLV, 1909, pp. 51-100.

[3] A thirteenth-century treatise on grammar in verse, one of the two most popular grammars of the late Middle Ages; the other was the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei.

[4] Francis A. Gasquet. *The Canterbury Claustral School in the Fifteenth Century*. In: *The Old English Bible and Other Essays*, London, 1897, pp. 260-285.

the new school;[5] then comes Colet's little catechism; next, the articles of faith; a short explanation of the seven sacraments; a few words on charity, subdivided into the love of God, the love of one's own self, the love of one's neighbor; resolutions concerning the reception of the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist—"If I fall to synne I shal anone ryse agayne by penaunce and pure confessyon. . . . As often as I shal receyue my lord in sacrament, I shall with al study dispose me to pure clennes and deuocyon"; resolutions concerning sickness and death; forty-nine precepts of living; the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's prayer and the Hail Mary; two prayers presumably composed by Colet himself, the first beginning *Sancta Maria, uirgo, & mater Iesu*, the second called the *Oratiuncula ad Puerum Iesvm Scholae Praesidem*, still said at St. Paul's.[6] Next we have Colet's letter to his first high master, worthy of quoting in its entirety:

Colet suo Lilio Salutem

Accipe, optime ac literatissime Lili, libellum puerilis institutionis, in quo quidem eadem, quae fuerunt ab alijs tradita, ratione et ordine paulo (ni fallor) commodiore digessimus. Idque fecimus, ut elementa grammatices et felicius influerent in puerorum animos et tenacius inhaererent. Tuum erit, qui primus Es huius nouae Pauli scholae praeceptor, his rudimentis diligenter exercere pueros nostros, deinceps ad maiora profecturos. Nihil enim aeque mihi cordi est in praesenti quam ut paruuli Christi quam plurimum apud te proficiant cum literatura, tum bonis moribus, ad quod si eniteris, et IESVM puerorum praesidem tibi tuo studio demereberis et me plane felicem reddideris. Vale ex aedibus meis, Calen. Augu. An. MDX.[7]

Immediately afterwards comes the preface to the book, not only showing how and why Colet composed his grammar, but likewise reflecting his tender solicitude for the welfare of his

[5] The text of these articles is given in J. H. Lupton's *A Life of John Colet*, 2d ed., London, 1909, pp. 285-292, together with most of the religious material that follows; in the *Shakespeare Jahrhbuch* reprint it is all found in Vol. XLIV, 1908, pp. 66-72.

[6] Cf. Lupton. *Colet*, p. 290, n. 1.

[7] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, p. 73.

young pupils. The piece breathes the gentleness and candid simplicity of the author's saintly life:

A lytell proheme to the boke

Al be it mani haue wryten and haue made certayne introduccyons in to latyn speche, called Donates and Accidens, in latyn tongue and in englysche, in such plenty that it shoulde seme to suffyse, Yet neuerthelesse for the loue and the zele that I haue vnto the new schole of Poules, and to the children of the same, somwhat I haue also compyled of the mater, and of the viii partes of grammer haue made this lytel boke, not thynkynge that I coude say ony thynge beter than hath be sayd before, but I toke this besynes, hauynge grete pleasure to shewe the testymony of my good mynde vnto the schole. In whiche lytel warke yf ony newe thynges be of me, it is alonely that I haue put tese partes in a more clere ordre, and haue made them a lytel more easy to yonge wyttes than (methynketh) they were before. Iudgyng that no thynghe may be to softe, nor to famylyer for lytel chyldren, specyally lernynge a tongue vnto them all straunge. In which lytel boke I haue lefte many thynges out of purpose, consyderyng the tendernes and small capacyte of lytel myndes: And that I haue spoken, also, I haue affyrmed it none otherwyse, but as it happeth moost comynly in latyn tongue. For many be the excepcyons, and harde it is ony thynge generally to assure in a speche soo varyous. I praye god all may be to his honour, and to the erudicyon and profyt of chyldren, my countre men Londoners specyally, whome dygestynge this lytel werke I had always before myn eyen, consyderynge more what was for them than to shewe ony grete connynge, wyllyng to speke the thynges often before spoken in suche maner as gladli yonge begynners and tender wyttes myght take and conceyue. Wherefore I praye you al lytel babys, al lytel chyldren, lerne gladly this lytel treatyse, and commende it dylygently vnto your memoryes. Trustynge of this begynnynge that ye shal procede and growe to parfyt lyterature, and come at the last to be grete clarkes. And lyfte vp your lytel whyte handes for me, whiche prayeth for you to god. To whom be al honour and imperyal maieste and glory. Amen.[8]

Prologi finis

All of this takes up eleven octavo pages, in the edition of 1527; then we come to the accidence proper, "An Introduceyon of the Parthes of Spekyng, for Children *and* Yonge Begynners, in to Latyn Speche." It requires forty-nine pages to make this introduction, which ends piously with an "Amen" and an epilogue pointing the way to further advancement in the language of

[8] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, pp. 73-74.

Rome—the orthodox Renaissance doctrine of reading the classics and making their usage one's guide.

For redyng of good bokes, diligent informacyon of taught maysters, studyous aduertence and takyng hede of lerners, heryng eloquent men speke, and finally seasy [*sic*] imitacyon with tongue and penne, more auayleth shortly to gete the true eloquent speche, than all the tradicions, rules, and preceptes of maysters.[9]

Explicit Coleti aeditio

It has been pointed out that Colet probably got his idea for the title, *Aeditio*, from Donatus, the famous teacher of St. Jerome. Donatus had composed two short grammatical treatises, the *Ars Minor*, for beginners, and the *Ars Maior*, for students further advanced. The first of these was sometimes called the *Editio Prima Donati*, the second, the *Editio Secunda*. Both were very popular during the Middle Ages, indeed up to the time of Colet. Dr. Blach thinks that the relationship between the *Ars Minor* and the *Aeditio* was a very close one.

To me, however, the two seem quite unlike. The *Aeditio* is much the simpler, "a lytel more easy to yong wyttes." And the language is different. In the *Aeditio* there is nothing said about accidents, but the properties of the several parts of speech are explained in words more likely to be understood by a child. Compare Colet's treatment of the noun with that of Donatus:

A nowne is the name of a thynge that is and may be seen, felte, herde, or vnderstande, As the name of my hande in latyn is *Manus*, the name of a hous is *Domus*, the name of goodnes is *Bonitas*.

The dyuisyon of nownes

Nownes, or the names of thynges, some be substantyues, some be adiectyues: A nowne substantyue is that standeth by hym selfe, and loketh not for an other worde to be ioyned with hym.

A nowne adiectyue is that can not stande by hymselfe, but loketh to be ioyned *with* another word, as *Bonus*, *Pulcher;* whan I say in latin *Bonus:* good, or *pulcher:* fayre, it loketh to tell what is good, or what is fayre, and therefore it must be ioyned *with* an other worde, as a good childe: *Bonus puer*, A fayre

[9] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLV, p. 55.

woman: *Pulchra foemina.* And a nowne adiectyue, eyther it hath thre terminacions, as *Bonus, bona, bonum,* or elles it is declyned *with* thre artycles: *Hic, haec, hoc,* as *hic, haec, et hoc foelix.*[10]

After Colet's *Aeditio* comes the *Gulielmi Lilij Angli Rudimenta,* which bears the heading, "To make latyn." The first line of the famous little syntax is the familiar, "Whan I have an englysshe to be tourned into latin I shal reherse it twyes or thries and loke out the verbe." The whole thing occupies only thirteen pages. Lily's *Carmen de Moribus*[11] is printed next, followed by three four-line Latin poems, singing the praises of the great schoolmaster; they were written by John Rightwise, Richard Vernamus (in other editions spelled Vernanus), and Richard Gunsonus. The volume ends with the Greek alphabet, in contemporary continental fashion, and bears the annoyingly incomplete colophon *Venumdantur Londinij in cymiterio Sancti Pauli, prope scholam.* As a final touch the book reproduces the royal coat of arms.

The *Rudimenta* is a syntax, corresponding to the accidence of Colet, but much shorter and perhaps even more elementary. It begins with the problem of how to turn "an englysshe" into Latin; the student is first to "look out" the verb, which is defined for him and classified as either "principal" or otherwise. Directions are then given for finding the principal verb, after which the subject of the sentence is likewise isolated and described. Next we have definitions of the relative and the antecedent, followed by short notes on the case of the relative, on the interrogatives, and on impersonal verbs. The boy is now introduced to the "three concords" of grammar—rules for the agreement of verb and substantive, of adjective and substantive, and of relative and antecedent. Then under the heading "Dyuers rules longyng to the first concorde" we are given a discussion of all three concords.

[10] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XLIV, p. 75.

[11] Or *Monita Paedagogica,* a poem in elegiac couplets, eighty-four lines in length, full of precepts and advice for the student of St. Paul's—quite in the tradition of mediaeval and Renaissance sapiential writings.

The rest of the text is taken up with "The knowledge of the oblique cases." Under this heading we have the simplest possible statement of the chief uses of the genitive and dative; under the accusative and ablative we get something fuller: we are told that "the accusatyue case answereth to this questyon who? or what? and cometh after the verb"; but that to this rule there are "dyuers excepcyons"—verbs having the same case after them as before, verbs having the genitive after them, the dative, or the ablative. Then we are told the chief rules for the use of the ablative, illustrated, as are all the rules, with well-chosen examples. The book ends with a few statements on "Cases with preposicyons," in which Lily treats place where, and motion to or from a place; like all the grammarians of his day, he makes no mention of the locative case, which he mistakes for the genitive singular of the first or second declension, or the ablative plural of the third.[12]

The *Rudimenta Grammatices* is not particularly well put together; there is some needless repetition, and there is a lack of order in the arrangement, part of which may perhaps be blamed upon the printers.[13] But it has the great merit of simplicity and clearness. There are no verses to be memorized, and for examples there are no difficult sentences from the classics. However, every statement that needs it has its illustration, made up no doubt from the first brief phrase or sentence that came into Lily's head. For instance, under the first concord we are told that "Two substantyues singuler wyl haue an adiectyue plurel, as Vergilius et Terentius sunt docti."

The sources of the *Rudimenta* I have been able to determine only in part. The title is the same as that employed by Perottus and by Sulpitius for grammars that were elementary only in comparison with the tomes of Priscian. Blach says that the book is a

[12] Some grammars (including some eighteenth-century editions of "Lily's Grammar") state the rule so as to include the ablative singular of the third, fourth and fifth declensions.

[13] See above, p. 90.

much shortened translation of Lily's *Libellus*,[14] and that it is similar to the *Longe Parvula*, which may therefore be considered a source.[15] As a matter of fact it has resemblances to all three of the *Pervula* group, and—apart from the question of dates—Lily might have made use of any or all of them. The introductory matter in all four of them is much the same; Lily states in declarative form what comes as question and answer in the *Pervula* series: "Whan I haue an englysshe to be tourned into latin I shal reherse it twyes or thries and loke out the verbe." Then, after directions for recognizing the verb: "If there be more verbes than one in the reason, the first is the principal verbe, so it be none infinityue mode," etc. The *Pervula* group have almost the same words, each slightly different, preceded by a question. The *Longe Parvula* begins thus: "What shalt thou do, whan thou hast an englysshe to make in latyn? I shal reherse myn englysshe ones, twyes or thryes, and loke out my pryncypal verbe."[16]

[14] *Absolutissimus de Octo Orationis Partium Libellus*, a short syntax in Latin. See below, pp. 98-101. The title varied, but it seldom contained the word *Absolutissimus;* it was often called the *Libellus* or the *De Octo* for the sake of brevity.

[15] XLV, p. 82; "Der von Lily verfasste syntaktische Teil stellt eine stark gekürzte auszügliche Übersetzung des von Lily verfassten, von Erasmus überarbeiteten *Absolutissimus* dar, wie er im 16. Jahrhundert meist als Anhang zur Formenlehre des kleinen Donat gedruckt wurde. Ähnlich wie diese Büchlein Lilys ist übrigens schon die von Varnhagen dem Stanbridge zugeschriebene *Longe Parvula* aufgebaut, die demnach als Quelle für den syntaktischen Teil mit in Betracht kommen dürfte."

The *Longe Parvula*, 1481, is a revised and augmented edition of the *Pervula*, almost certainly printed before the *Longe Parvula*, although in the same year. A third edition, likewise revised and augmented, appeared later with the title *Parvulorum Institutio*. At least the first two of these grammars are, in all probability, the work of John Stanbridge, an usher at Magdalen when Lily studied there. See Hermann Varnhagen. *De Duobus Foliis Libri Cuiusdam Anglici Adhuc Ignoti Exeunte Saeculo Quinto Decimo Typis Excusi Quae in Museo Brittanico Asservantur*, Erlangen, 1906, pp. 4, 15; Wilhelm Gräder, ed. *Parvulorum Institutio ex Stanbrigiana Collectione*, Erlangen, 1912, p. 9.

[16] In his *Fifteenth Century English Books*, 1917 (No. 373), E. Gordon Duff gives these words as the *incipit* of a copy of Stanbridge's *Vocabula*. Actually the book he is describing (now in the Pepysian Library) is not the *Vocabula*, but another edition of the *Longe Parvula*, hitherto unrecorded. Duff has been followed in this error by the *Short-Title Catalogue* (No. 23177), and by Foster Watson, p. 233. See my letter to the London *Times Literary Supplement*, December 9, 1939, p. 717.

It seems likely that Lily used the *Pervula*, which alone of the series has the three concords set out together as Lily has them. In other instances the language seems rather to resemble more closely that of one of the others; the first part, for example, is in some ways more like the *Institutio Parvulorum;* in discussing the case of the relative the order in the *Rudimenta* differs from that of all the others, but the language approximates more closely to that of the *Institutio Parvulorum* and the *Longe Parvula* than to that of the *Pervula*. What we know of the dates will not be of great help to us. Certainly the *Pervula* and the *Longe Parvula* were composed before Lily wrote, and possibly the *Institutio Parvulorum*. The earliest known edition of the latter is 1520 (cf. Gräder, p. 9); but there is no reason why it could not have been in existence fifteen years earlier. As for the *Rudimenta*, we are uncertain as to when Lily put it together, although all the evidence points to an early date. The earliest known edition (a small quarto, of which the only surviving copy is in the Bodleian—it is not recorded in *STC*) came from the press of Wynkyn de Worde. An examination of the type suggests a probable date of cir. 1509. (Plimpton's guess of 1512 or 1513 for an edition by Treveris of which he owned a copy is, I think—likewise on typographical grounds—fifteen years too early.)[17]

Whatever Lily took from the Stanbridge grammars, it must not be lost sight of that he made important changes in his sources. The *Pervula* and the *Longe Parvula*, after explaining the rules in English prose, put them into Latin verse for memorizing.[18] Lily has done away with the verses. The *Institutio Parvulorum* has a

[17] George A. Plimpton. *The Education of Shakespeare*, London and New York, 1933, p. 87. For aid in arriving at these conclusions I am indebted to Mr. William A. Jackson.

[18] It is instructive to reflect that the use of verse begun by the mediaeval grammarians was continued by many of their Renaissance successors, notably by Antonio Mancinelli, in his *Spica Quatuor Voluminum*, Venice, 1491; Despauterius, or Ian van Pauteren, author of a whole series of grammatical poems designed to replace the work of Alexander de Villa Dei; and John Anwykyll, author of the *Compendium Totius Grammatice*, Oxford, 1483, probably one of Lily's teachers at Magdalen.

good many long examples from the classics; the *Rudimenta*, like the *Pervula* and *Longe Parvula*, has short and simple ones. Lily has abandoned the catechetical method, although he keeps the personal tone—"I shall reherse it." But chiefly Lily has simplified the grammar: he does not assume, as did his predecessors, that the student knows what a verb is; he tells him, and illustrates his statements with examples easily understood. And when he gets to the dative case, before giving rules for its use, he gives the boy some elementary idea of what his words mean: "The datyue case answereth to this question: to whome? or to what? so that include no mouynge, as I agree to the: *Assentior tibi.* A greuous thynge to me: *Mihi molestum.*"[19]

Dr. Blach's other statement, that the *Rudimenta* is a translation, though much shortened, of the *Libellus*,[20] seems to me wholly lacking support. There are, of course, a few expressions and a few examples which any man composing the two would find it easier to repeat than not. But the differences are so great and the similarities so few that no one—I venture to say—from a mere comparison of the texts, would suspect identity of authorship. The arrangement and the whole method of approach are different. Instead of the crude plan of the *Rudimenta*—preliminary notions, the concords, and the oblique cases—we have here a neater, more compact, more orderly treatment of the different parts of speech, beginning with the verb and ending with the preposition. Substantially it is the order of Donatus, Perottus, and Sulpitius. The method of the *Rudimenta* is simpler, designed for students who actually do not know the rudiments. Its character is reflected in the language employed; the *Libellus*, for example, begins thus: "Omne uerbum antecedit nominatiuus agentis se patientis eiusdem numeri, & personae, ut. Ego doleo, Tu gaudes." The verb is not defined, nor the nominative; there are no directions for finding either; nothing is said about the first concord, although the

[19] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLV, p. 68.

[20] See above, p. 92, and n. 15; below, pp. 98-101.

thing itself is there. Compare this succinct, packed style with the more diffuse, elementary language of the *Rudimenta*. The section on the nominative case reads as follows:

> Somtyme the nomynatyue case [cometh] after the verbe or after the sygne of the verbe, as in reasons interrogatyues, optatiues, and in reasons hauynge it or there, with such other before the verbe, as thus: Cometht[*sic*] the kynge? or dothe the kynge come? *Venit ne rex?* Gowe or let vs go: *Eamus*. There standeth a man in the dore: *Stat quidam apud ostium*. It is my brother: *Est frater meus*.[21]

Obviously the two texts were composed for different kinds of students. We know that Lily was responsible for both; but to say that either is a translation of the other is reading similarities into the little books that are not there.

The Grammar of Colet and Lily was given a new lease on life by the grace of Cardinal Wolsey, who admired it to such an extent that he took it over for the use of his scholars at Ipswich; the title of one of the two copies in the British Museum is as follows: *Rudimenta Grammatices et Docendi Methodus, Non Tam Scholae Gypsuichianae per Reuerendissimum. D. Thomam Cardinalem Eboraconsem. Feliciter Institutae, quam Omnibus Aliis Totius Anglie Scholis Prescripta*. London: Peter Treueris, 1529. 4°.[22]

But Wolsey did more than give the book a new title and the approval of his high name; he added some prefatory material not unworthy of the former *informator* of Magdalen Grammar School.[23] First comes an introductory verse in Latin, "Ad Lectorem." Then we get the inevitable preface, directed to the masters of Ipswich School, in which His Eminence points out that a

[21] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLV, p. 57.

[22] The title of the other is the same, but the edition is different; the second book came from the press of Martin Caesar at Antwerp, in 1535.

[23] The remark of Foster Watson in *The English Grammar Schools to 1660*, Cambridge, 1908, p. 250, that this grammar "is founded on Colet's" is of course inadequate and misleading. The same may be said of a statement by Fuller's mortal enemy, Peter Heylyn, in *Ecclesia Restaurata*, ed. J. C. Robertson, Cambridge, 1849, I, p. 74, "where Wolsey is said to have contributed to William Lily's Latin grammar, which was issued with Henry VIII's approval and imposed upon all schools by Edward VI's 'injunctions' of 1547."—A. F. Pollard. *Wolsey*, London and New York, 1929, p. 337, n. 3. Wolsey's contributions were not retained in the editions of 1540 and after.

school is useless without teachers, two of whom have been appointed to teach morals and literature to the youth in their charge, the hope of the commonwealth; that to enable these teachers to perform their duties he is providing textbooks, and a treatise on the method and theory of teaching, as well. This is followed by a two-page[24] discussion of the question, "quo ordine pueri in nostrum gymnasium admissi docendi sint, quique authores eiisdem [*sic*] prelegendi." Next we are given specific directions for teaching the eight classes into which the boys are divided; though comprehensive, these directions have the merit of brevity—they occupy only three pages. In the Treveris edition the text of the grammar, identical at least in order with that of the 1527 edition, follows immediately; but in the Antwerp edition we have justice done to the original compilers in the form of another title-page, bearing the familiar *Ioannis Coleti Theologi, Olim Decani Divi Pauli, Aeditio, una cum Quibusdam G. Lilij Grammatices Rudimenta,* inserted between the new and the old material. The Antwerp edition likewise added two other sections, "De Nominibus Heteroclitis" and "Regulae Versificales," besides a Greek and a Latin vocabulary.

There is one point of considerable interest in the history of the Wolsey grammar which is not, unfortunately, altogether clear. Apparently the significance of the title escaped Lupton; at least he does not mention it. We are told that the book was prescribed for use in all the schools of England: ". . . non tam scholae Gypsuichianae . . . institutae, quam omnibus aliis totius Anglie scholis prescripta." Watson observes that it "was intended not only for Ipswich, and its masters, but as a model for the organized education of 'British youth.' "[25] But the language of the title implies much more than this—it was "prescribed," not merely offered as a model that might be followed at the teacher's choice. It would be extremely interesting to know precisely what

[24] In the quarto edition.

[25] P. 250.

this means. Fuller says that Henry had determined as early as 1519 to introduce uniformity into the teaching of grammar;[26] but he offers no evidence. However, he does refer to a regulation on this subject adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury on March 8, 1530:

> Octavo die Martii (sess. LIII) de reformatione scholarum grammaticalium actum fuit: quia "multiplex et varius in scholis grammaticalibus modus est docendi grammaticam, visum fuit necessarium, quod una et eadem edatur formula auctoritate hujus sacrae synodi, in qualibet et singula schola grammaticali per Cant. provinciam usitanda et edocenda."—David Wilkins, *Concilia*, London, 1737, III, pp. 725-726.

When we consider the date of what is probably the first edition—June 4, 1529 (that of the preface is August 1, 1528)—we can sense the connection: obviously there was a movement on foot to regularize instruction, and "Wolsey's grammar" was chosen as a text. But we are ignorant of further details; and it is unlikely that the falling Chancellor had much time to spend on such matters as grammar. Things were coming to a head for Wolsey. By the time that Treveris was able to display the book, with the Cardinal's arms on the title-page, the papal legate, Campeggio, was opening the trial of the King's marriage. In July the court was prorogued; Pope Clement recalled the case to Rome; almost simultaneously the Emperor and Francis were signing the Peace of Cambrai—the blow "which wrecked Wolsey's foreign policy."[27] The mighty chancellor was ruined; he had failed his master at home and abroad. In October he was deprived of the seals of his office. Another month, and he was within a year from the day when he should be arrested for treason and shortly afterwards die.

Thus a little more than two years from the day on which he wrote the preface Wolsey was no more; and his school at Ipswich had been dissolved.[28] Did he have time to see to it that his

[26] Thomas Fuller. *An Appeal of Injured Innocence*, London, 1659, p. 455.

[27] R. W. Chambers. *Thomas More*, London and New York, 1935, p. 232.

[28] James Gairdner, in his article on Wolsey in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, puts this in the early summer of 1530.

grammar was adopted by all the schools of England? It seems quite unlikely, both from the scarcity of extant copies,[29] and from the shortness of the time between the first edition and his death —a period when, we may presume, he had more to think about than the Latinity of English youth.

Whatever be the truth of the matter, a decade after Wolsey put out his text an official grammar was appointed to replace that and all others. King Henry issued a book based in part on the one that Wolsey had adopted, with a preface which declared in unmistakable terms the royal command that it be used exclusively throughout England.[30] This was a typical Tudor measure; as Watson says, after printing was invented "there was no way of asserting the Royal Supremacy more effectively than by the issue of authoritative books for public and private use."[31] (In this connection, too, Watson points out that the authorized grammar of 1540 preceded the issuance of the authorized Book of Common Prayer, which appeared first in 1549, with a preface which gave reasons for its compilation similar to those given for composing the grammar.) But it is interesting to find indications of authorized editions ten years before Henry's grammar appeared. One wonders if the idea did not originate with the unhappy Cardinal who initiated so much and accomplished so little; if it did it is ironic in the extreme that this, of all his projects, should have been the one to be carried on most successfully after his death.

Libellus de Constructione Octo Partium Orationis

The *Libellus* is a syntax in Latin, which takes up about twenty leaves in the beautiful quartos, with their generous margins and their large print, which were not considered too fine for mere grammars by the best printing houses in sixteenth-century Eu-

[29] It must be remembered, however, that of all books it is textbooks which are least likely to survive: more than any others they run the risk of being "literally thumbed out of existence."

[30] See below, p. 104.

[31] P. 260. Cf. p. 252.

rope. The authorship of the book has not been altogether easy to determine: a preface by Colet to the first edition, which issued from the press of Pynson in 1513, seems to say that Colet wrote it; a great many editions which subsequently appeared on the Continent bore the name of Erasmus; but a preface by Erasmus which appeared in some of the editions of 1515, and in many of the later onés, says that Lily wrote the grammar at Colet's request; that Colet then handed it over to Erasmus for emendation; that the latter emended it by changing many things. Without going into the details of the argument, we may say that this is substantially the view accepted by scholars to-day.[32]

The *Libellus* was printed in both octavo and quarto all over Europe, in a multitude of editions, till near the end of the sixteenth century. Although various titles have been used, the substance of the text never varies--in matters of importance—in any of the copies I have examined.[33] The reason for the popularity of the book is not hard to see, when one compares it with other available texts of the time. As has already been noted (see above pp. 94-95), the book was for those who had passed the elementary stage; it would not compete with such a text as, for example, the Colet-Lily Grammar. But it was infinitely simpler and much shorter than either the grammar of Perottus or of Sulpitius; it had no verses to memorize, no questions to waste space; it had a

[32] The book is catalogued under Lily's name in the chief libraries of England, although some of the great continental libraries (including the Vatican, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the National-Bibliothek of Vienna) still list it under the name of Erasmus. But I am assured by Professor Alphonse Roersch, one of the editors of the *Bibliographica Belgica*, that the project once entertained of including the grammar among the books of Erasmus has been abandoned.

[33] I have collected notices of almost two hundred editions, ranging in time from 1513 to 1595, and in space from Venice to Cracow, but I have not nearly covered the field. Lupton says (*Dictionary of National Biography*, art. "Lily, William") that Lily has been accused by a writer in the *Monthly Review*, I, 1747, p. 28 (an error for the *Universal Magazine*, I, 1747, p. 28, which has been cleverly traced as the source of the statement by Miss Gertrude Chalmers of the University of Chicago Libraries), of taking over the *Libellus* from a work with a similar title by Leonicenus Omnibonus. He has compared the two and found no resemblance whatever; he thinks that the charge arises from the similarity of title. This is quite likely; there are many grammars with titles exactly the same, or nearly so.

sufficiency of examples, without elaborate quotations from the classics. Altogether it must have seemed a rather satisfactory text to the student in the second stage of his grammar training.

A table of contents will make the plan of organization of the *Libellus* clearer:

De Constructione Verbi
- Nominatiuus ante uerbum
- Genitiuus post uerbum
- Datiuus post uerbum
- Accusatiuus post uerbum
- Ablatiuus post uerbum
- Gerundia, gerundiua nomina, supina, de participiis, de nominibus uerbalibus

De Constructione Nominis
- Genitiuus post nomen
- Datiuus post nomen
- Accusatiuus post nomen
- Ablatiuus post nomen

Pronominum Constructio
Aduerbiorum Constructio
Prepositionum Constructio
De Constructione Coniunctionum
De Constructione Interiectionum

The method of the *Libellus* may be seen in the section on the verb. Lily begins by saying that the nominative of the agent or of the person receiving the action precedes the verb; and adds that it agrees with that verb in number and case. He then explains and qualifies this statement with four appendices and two exceptions—the impersonals and the infinitive-accusative. Then he lists, classifies and discusses the verbs that take after them the genitive, the dative, accusative, and ablative. After finishing the verb he treats of those cases in which a noun is followed by another in the genitive, the dative, the accusative, the ablative. The other parts of speech receive, of course, the simpler treatment that their nature demands.

No doubt many instances of similarity, or even identity, of

language could be shown between Lily and earlier grammarians. But these resemblances, I am convinced, are relatively unimportant; whatever use Lily made of the works of others, he certainly improved, in clearness and brevity, upon any of his predecessors with whom we are acquainted.

De Generibus Nominum ac Verborum Praeteritis et Supinis Regulae

Quite independent of the *Rudimenta* and the *Libellus* are two short Latin grammatical poems on accidence which Lily apparently designed as part of a complete series.[34] As we have already noted, in choosing verse for his medium, Lily was following not only the tradition of Evrard and Alexander, but likewise the practice of some of the most respected of the humanist grammarians.[35]

The poems may have been first published by themselves, but the earliest edition I have been able to find is that of 1525—a copy of which is now in the British Museum—revised and augmented by Lily's successor at St. Paul's, his son-in-law John Rightwise, with a vocabulary contributed by the latter. The title runs as follows: *GVILIELMO LILII GRAMMAtici et Poetae Eximij. Paulinae Scholae Olim Moderatioris. De Generibus Nominum. Ac Verborum Praeteritis et Supinis Regulae Pueris Apprime Utiles. Opus Recognitum & Adauctum cum Nominum ac Verborum Interpretamentis. per Ioannem Rituissi* [*sic*] *Scholae Paulinae Praeceptoris.* [Colophon] *Antuerpiae in Rapa, Anno M.D X X V. Mense Iunio.* This would suggest an earlier edition, although it is possible that it was an unpublished text which Rightwise revised. The British Museum Cata-

[34] This is the inference to be drawn from the last line of the *Propria quae maribus* (see below, pp. 38-39).

> Sunt quae deficient genere, adiectiua notanda,
> De quibus atque alijs alibi tibi mentio fiet.

Thomas Robertson, editor of the 1532 Basle edition, comments as follows (fol. F1): "Ex hoc loco apparet Lilium de nominibus ἑτεροκλίτοις aut scripsisse quae nondum prodierint, aut habuisse in animo ut scriberet, morte tamen praeuentum non absoluisse." See below, p. 102.

[35] See above, p. 93, n. 18.

logue lists another edition, *s. l. d.*, with the query 1520?, but the date must be too early, as Lily was still flourishing as headmaster in 1520. The title of the book is the same in both editions.

A third edition, finely printed, appeared in 1532; copies of it can be seen to-day in the principal libraries of Europe. The title shows a new editor and new material, and the absence of the former editor's vocabulary: *GVILELMI LILII, OLIM SCHOLAE PAULINAE Apud Londinum Moderatoris, de Latinorum Nominum Generibus, de Verborum Praeteritis & Supinis, Regulae non Minus Utiles, quam Compendiosae, cum Annotationibus THOMAE ROBERTSONI Eboracensis. QUIBUS Accessit de Nominibus Heteroclitis, de Verbis Defectiuis, ac Demum de Versibus Pangendis, Auctarium Neutiquam Poenitendum, per Eundem THOMAM ROBERTSONUM, Appositis Vbique Annotationibus.* [Colophon] *BASILEAE, PER IO. BEBELIVM, ET AND. CRATANDRVM, MENSE AVGVSTO, ANNO M. D. XXXII.*

The new editor, a scholar of distinction, had been master of Magdalen Grammar School since 1526. In the epistle dedicatory he explains why he undertakes to put out a new edition—errors had marred the earlier text, owing no doubt to the premature death of Lily, who had left his work unfinished, and owing also to the haste of the printers who had, as it were, snatched the book from the bier of its author to get it on the stalls. Besides, he wishes to round out the work with sections which Lily had not filled in. He hopes that the book will take its place as the standard accidence, along with the *Libellus* for syntax, and the *Tabula de Schematibus* of Petrus Mosellanus for versification.

The text proper is divided into five sections. Part I, on the genders of nouns, is Lily's *Regulae Generales Propriorum*, of which the first line is the well-known *Propria quae maribus tribuuntur mascula dicas.* Robertson's annotations, in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, are printed on every page beneath the verses; text and commentary occupy seventeen folios. This is followed by a page

and a half to the reader serving as an introduction to the next section; it ends with four Greek verses from Theognis.

Section II consists of Robertson's poem on the heteroclites, with his own annotations, covering ten folios. The opening verse runs:

Quae genus aut flexum uariant, quaecumque nouato.

It was obviously written to match Lily's two poems, the second of which makes up Part III. This is devoted to the preterites of the simple verbs and the supine; it begins with

As in presenti perfectum format in avi.

Like the other two pieces it has its commentary, the whole taking up a trifle over fifteen folios.

Part IV, modestly entitled an *Appendix*, is a much shorter verse treatise on defective verbs, with a few notes—all by Robertson. The text occupies only two and a half leaves.

Next we get another address to the reader, a page and a half in length, ending with an appropriate line (in Greek characters) from Theocritus. Part V keeps up the scholarly tone: it begins with two lines from Callimachus, likewise in Greek. The section is entitled *Compendium Versificationis, seu* ΣΤΙΧΟΛΟΓΙΑ. Like Parts II and IV, it is the work of Robertson, and, though in prose, it has the inevitable accompanying notes. It is over seventeen folios long.

But the work was not destined to be as popular as Lily's Latin syntax; evidently the vogue of Latin grammars in verse was on the wane. In a fairly extensive search I have come upon only five other separate editions, the latest from Cologne in 1555. But most of the text was incorporated in the *Institutio Compendiaria*, the Latin part of the grammar in its final form (see below, p. 104).

I have not considered it within the scope of this study to compare the text with either the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei or the *Grecismus* of Evrard de Bethune; but it should surprise no one to find that Lily borrowed from both. That is what his con-

temporaries would expect; that is precisely how Stanbridge worked.[36]

The Final Form of the Grammar

As we have already seen, a movement was on foot during the lifetime of Cardinal Wolsey to regularize the teaching of grammar.[37] Nothing was to come of this for some time; but about 1540 a new text made its appearance, based on the *Aeditio-Rudimenta*, the *Libellus*, and the *De Generibus Nominum*; it bore a preface which made its use mandatory in the teaching of Latin in England.

Henry the VIII. . . . to all schoolemaisters and teachers of grammar within this his realm greetynge. . . . to the intent that herafter they [English children] may the more readily and easily attein the rudymentes of the latyne toung, without the greate hynderaunce, which heretofore hath been, through the diuersitie of grammers and teachynges: we will and commaunde, and streightly charge al you schoolemaisters and teachers of grammer within this our realme, and other our dominions, as ye intend to auoyde our displeasure, and haue our favour, to teache and learne your scholars this englysshe introduction here ensuing, and the latyne grammer annexed to the same, and none other, which we haue caused for your ease, and your scholars spedy preferment bryefely and playnely to be compyled and set forth. Fayle not to apply your scholars in lernynge and godly education.

This was followed by an address to the fathers of families, the schoolmasters, and the "tender babes" of England, written apparently by the printer. It explains much of the history of the book.

To the reder

. . . And as his maiesty purposeth to establyshe his people in one consent and harmony of pure and tru relygion: so his tender goodnes toward the youth and chyldhode of his realme, entendeth to haue it brought vp vnder one absolute and vniforme sorte of lernynge. For his maiestie consideryng the great encombrance and confusion of the yong and tender wittes, by reason of the diuersity of grammer rules and teachinges. (For here tofore euery maister had his grammer, and euery schole dyuers teachynges, and chaungyng of maisters and scholes dyd many tymes vtterly dull and vndo good wyttes) hath appoynted certein lerned

[36] As Gräder demonstrates, pp. 18-20; and Watson, p. 234.

[37] See above, pp. 95-98.

men mete for such a purpose, to compile one bryef, plaine, and vniforme grammer, which onely (al other set a part) for the more spedynesse, and lesse trouble of yong wittes, his hyghnes hath commanded all scholemaysters and teachers of grammer, within this his realme, and other his dominions, to teache their scholers. . . . And somewhat to declare vnto you the condition and qualitie of this grammer, ye shall vnderstand, that the VIII partes of spech, and the Construction of the same, be not here set forth in engylsshe at large, but compendyously and briefely for the weake capacitie of yong and tender wyttes. And therfore if anythyng semeth here to want in this englyshe Introductions, ye shall vnderstande, it was left out of purpose, and shall be supplied in the latyn rules made for the same intent, whiche chyldren shalbe apte to lerne, what tyme they shall haue competent vnderstandyng by these former rudimentes.[38]

The earliest known edition of the new text is that represented by the handsome quarto on vellum now in the British Museum (*S. T. C.* 15605). The grammar proper is preceded by one gathering (four leaves) taken up with the alphabet and a "catechism" in both Latin and English. It differs considerably from Colet's catechism: the sections on charity and the seven sacraments are left out, as well as the *Oratiuncula ad puerum Iesum;* the "preceptes of lyvynge" are transferred, much altered, but with a Latin translation, to the body of the book, under the title "Godly lessons for Chyldren"; the ten commandments and two new prayers are put in their stead. In fact all that is left is the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed, the Commandments, the summary of the Commandments in Matthew 22: 37-40, the "golden rule" (from Matthew 7: 12), a verse from 1 James 1: 17, and the two new prayers—all in both Latin and English except the two verses from St. Matthew, which appear in English alone.[39]

[38] Both prefaces are reprinted in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* XLV, 1909, pp. 85-86.

[39] Lupton, *Notes and Queries,* VI series, II, 1880, 461, says "taking also into account the alterations in the religious rudiments prefixed, we might fairly call the Grammar, in this its second stage [beginning c. 1540], an important document of state closely connected with the Reformation." But there is nothing in the "religious rudiments" of the 1540 edition which could be said to savor of the Reformation, except possibly the enumeration of the commandments, which is that of modern English Protestantism, but which could hardly at that time have been distinctive—the numbering found to-day in Catholic Bibles was not determined until the Council of Trent. And, so far as we can tell from the fragment of the 1548 edition that survives, there was nothing particularly Protestant about that issue: as a matter of fact,

As both prefaces indicate, there are two parts to the new text, one an elementary manual for beginners, in English, the other a more complete treatise in Latin. Each section has its own title, although the two were commonly printed and bound together throughout their long and varied history.

The English part is called *An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche, and the Construction of the Same, Compiled and Sette Forthe by the Comaundement of Our Most Gracious Soverayne Lorde the King.* It consists of an accidence, based on Colet's *Aeditio,* and a syntax based on Lily's *Rudimenta* and his *Libellus;* it includes Lily's famous *Carmen de Moribus.*[40]

The Latin section follows, with a title that modestly disclaims all pretense at completeness, while boldly vindicating its high authority: *Institutio Compendiaria Totius Grammaticae, Quam Et Eruditissimus Atque Idem Illustrissimus Rex Noster Hoc Nomine Euulgari Iussit. ut non Alia Quam haec Una per Totam Angliam Pueris Praelegeretur.* The colophon runs: *Londini, Ex Officina Thomae Bertheleti Typis Impres. Cum Privilegio Ad Imprimendum Solum. Anno Verbi Incarnati.* M. D. XL.

It is to be noted that the date of the *Institutio* is 1540, both on the title-page and in the colophon.[41] But that of *An Introduction* is 1542, while the little catechism has still another date, 1543.

The situation is not altogether clear. The English *Introduction,* dated 1542, speaks twice (in the two prefaces) of the Latin part. But we have a copy of the Latin part dated 1540. This might suggest, since in later editions both parts are usually found together,[42] that the English part was likewise in print by 1540. How-

---

there is nothing of a religious nature on the four leaves at Lambeth—except one prayer to which any Christian might whole-heartedly have subscribed.

[40] See above, p. 90, n. 11.

[41] The *Short-Title Catalogue* does not list this edition of the *Institutio* at all; it treats the British Museum copy as part of *An Introduction,* the date of which is given as 1542-43 (No. 15605).

[42] An exception appears to be the Britwell copy (now at the Huntington Library) of the *Institutio* of 1543, which seems to have no extant counterpart except the *An Introduction* of 1544, likewise purchased by Huntington from the Britwell Court collection.

ever, this conclusion is not inescapable: even though *An Introduction*, being a book for beginners, naturally preceded the *Institutio Compendiaria* in use, and is for this reason bound up before its Latin counterpart in the Museum copy we are discussing, as well as in all subsequent volumes, nevertheless it need not have been written first. The two sections show a remarkable similarity; the Latin is indeed longer than the English treatise, but not so much longer as one would be led by the prefaces to believe. As a matter of fact, the suspicion presents itself that both were not in the original plan—that whichever part was composed first, it was more or less as an afterthought that the other was drawn up, and that quite clearly on the basis of the one already completed. Hence it may well be that the *Institutio Compendiaria* was published first; and that when it was felt too difficult for tender wits, *An Introduction* was provided as more suitable.

This position is strengthened, I think, by the evidence of the one other remaining copy of the 1540 *Institutio Compendiaria*. The book is (or was) in Lambeth Palace library. On one of the preliminary pages appears the device of Prince Edward, gorgeously painted in by hand.[43] Now this has led to the altogether likely supposition that we have here the copy made expressly for His Highness; the corresponding page in the Museum copy is blank. Could it not be that the *Institutio Compendiaria* was first printed in 1540, the first copy of the edition being given to the boy? Nothing would please Henry more. What did it matter if the three-year old pupil was hardly ready for it? He could wait. In any event the appropriate thing would be to give him the first book

[43] Cf. S. R. Maitland. *A List of Some of the Early Printed Books in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, London, 1843, pp. 386-387, who gives a detailed description of the page on which the "illumination" occurs: "Blank, as it regards printing; but nearly covered by an illumination, consisting of a frame almost 5½ inches high by about 4 inches in width, containing a circle of about 2 inches diameter, with large golden rays issuing from its circumference. In the interior of this circle are the Prince of Wales's feathers passing through a coronet, and with their label and motto beneath. The ground of this interior is party per pale azure and gules, and in the space on the dexter side is a golden E, while in the corresponding space on the other side is a similar P."

that Berthelet could get ready. Of course a copy of *An Introduction* dated 1540 may some day turn up, likewise bearing the arms of Edward. But until it does I believe that we may not unreasonably suppose that when the Latin section was published, either Henry himself or the compilers decided that even the precocious mind of young Edward would do well to begin with an English introduction. In any case, that the latter part as well as the former was intended for the use of the prince is indicated by line 231 of *An Introduction:* whereas in later editions we read, "*Joannes* is my propre name," here we have *Eduardus.*

Maitland has described the *Institutio Compendiaria* in his catalogue of the library at Lambeth.[44] It begins with an address to all the schoolmasters of the realm: *Totius Angliae Ludimagistris;* and another to the reader. Then comes Edward's device.

The text is divided into four unequal sections, preceded by a definition of grammar and a statement of its divisions, which divisions, in fact if not in exact wording, go back to Priscian. The four parts may be schematized as follows:

I. *De Orthographia.* (*Est recte scribendi ratio.*)
De literis.
De syllabarum distinctionibus.
De orthopoeia. (*Est emendate recteque loquendi ratio.*)
De sententiarum punctis.
This material, which takes up only a few pages, is not in the Colet-Lily grammar; it is quite mediaeval in origin.

II. *De Etymologia.* Here we learn that "etymology" has two meanings—the same two meanings borne by the word *Formenlehre* in modern German:

A. The study which is concerned with investigating the origins of words;

B. The study which is concerned with the inflections of words: *ratio cognoscendi casuum discrimina;* that is to say, ac-

[44] *A List,* pp. 207, 385-392.

cidence. In this book the word will be used in the second sense. The compiler goes through the eight parts of speech. Under the noun we get a treatment of gender; it turns out to be Lily's *Propria*, with a prose comment, and at least one considerable addition. For the heteroclites we find Robertson's *Quae Genus*. For the verb we have Lily's poem *As in Praesenti* (with variations), on the preterites of the simple verbs; followed by Robertson's verses on the defective verbs (with prose comments and some changes in the text.) There is also some other material, which was probably derived from the *Aeditio-Rudimenta*.[45]

III. *Syntaxis. De Constructione Octo Partium Orationis.* But first we are given a few words about the "three concords" in general, taken from Lily's *Rudimenta*. After this comes the Syntax proper, which bears certain resemblances to the *Libellus*. The section closes with eight pages *De Figuris* —according to Ward, the verbal figures are from Petrus Mosellanus, "tho neither the definitions, nor the examples, are intirely[*sic*] the same with his, and the Figures of construction were borrowed from Gerard Listrius, a learned physician and friend of Erasmus."[46]

IV. *De Prosodia.* First drawn up by Robertson, but since much enlarged.[47]

The only other known editions of the grammar in exactly this stage are a quarto of 1543 recently in the possession of Quaritch,[48] and two octavos, an *Institutio Compendiaria* for 1543, and

[45] I know of no basis for the statement of Miss Mary Beth Stewart in *William Lily's Contribution to Classical Study*, in *The Classical Journal*, XXXIII, 1938, p. 220: "Lily divides his *De Grammatica* into four main heads, of which only the first two are definitely known to be entirely Lily's own work. . . ."

[46] John Ward, in the preface to an edition of the grammar which appeared first about 1732; I quote from the edition of London, 1752. Fol. A3v. See below, p. 112.

[47] Ibid.

[48] See Bernard Quaritch. *A Catalogue of Rare and Valuable Early Schoolbooks* [No. 464], London, 1932, pp. 40-41. The title-page of the *Institutio Compendiaria* is reproduced, full size.

An Introduction for 1544 mentioned in *The Britwell Handlist.*[49] All were published by Berthelet.

The next extant edition carries a different title, the title that the grammar has borne throughout most of its career: *A Shorte Introduction of Grammar, Generally to be Used in the Kynges Maiesties Dominions, for the Bryngynge up of all Those that Entende to Atteyne the Knowledge of the Latin Tongue.* An. Domini 1548.[50] The book, which is a quarto, survives in only one fragment of four leaves now at Lambeth.[51] It carries a preface written in the name of the ten-year old king, much like the one by his father; it mentions that the printer was Reginald Wolf. A second preface replaces Berthelet's; its opening words, "To exhort every man to the learning of Grammar. . . ." became familiar to every user of the book from then until the nineteenth century; full of advice on the way to study, it was adopted as the standard preface, and was hardly ever left out of an edition.

The book continued to be printed (though not, it would seem, very frequently)[52] until 1574, when the first of the familiar octavos appeared. Minor changes are found in this edition,[53] which was printed by Francis Flower (or Flowar) "to whom was granted for life the 'privilege' for printing the Grammar, Dec. 15, 1573."[54] But Flower soon turned his privilege into cash. A year from the following Christmas he transferred his right to six "assigns," who paid him a yearly rent of a hundred pounds.[55]

[49] [Sydney R. C. Miller]. *The Britwell Handlist,* London, 1933, II, p. 590. The two octavos are now in the Huntington Library.

[50] This, the title of the English section, gave its name to the whole book, although the separate title-page for the Latin part was retained until revision had altered the work rather thoroughly.

[51] See description in Maitland, pp. 426-427.

[52] I have found (in a search limited to a score of the leading European and American libraries, besides a few lesser ones) only six editions, three of them continental, between those of 1548 and 1574. A copy of the 1574 edition is in the Bodleian.

[53] Lupton (DNB, art. "Lily, William") is misleading when he remarks that "by 1574 the work was issued . . . with a fresh title." As a matter of fact the fresh title dates from the edition of 1548.

[54] Watson, p. 255. [55] Ibid.

From this we can judge how valuable a piece of property the Grammar had become.

"Lily's Grammar" was now on its way, literally, to fame and fortune. It would soon be in the hands of Shakespeare, and in the hands of almost every other English boy who would learn Latin, for many years to come. No count has ever been made of the many editions the book enjoyed during its long life; but Watson points out that during Elizabeth's reign, when 1250 copies of a book constituted an ordinary "edition," 10,000 copies of the Grammar were allowed to be printed annually.[56] I myself have seen almost a hundred different editions which appeared in the two centuries following Elizabeth's death; and I have by no means made a thorough search. This gives some evidence of the enormous circulation of the Grammar.

Lily's Grammar continued to receive official recognition of its unique position. The Injunctions of Edward VI for December 2, 1547, followed by those of Queen Elizabeth for 1559, repeated the commands of their departed father. Nor was ecclesiastical approbation lacking: the Canons Ecclesiastical of 1571 endorsed the Injunction of King Edward, and those of 1604 reiterated the endorsement in Article 79.[57] As Watson observes, this "establishes the authorization of Lily's Grammar (it is to be presumed) down to our own days."[58] It should not be overlooked that this monopoly did not go without opposition: several attacks were made upon it, the last in 1675, when a bill was introduced into the House of Lords to take from Lily's Grammar its official status. After a first reading, however, the bill was dropped. Actually, of course, by this time many "unauthorized" grammars were in the field; but officially Lily's still held its place, as, apparently, it holds its place to-day.

[56] P. 255.

[57] That the law was enforced is indicated by the presence in the episcopal articles of visitation of questions concerning the use of the Grammar, from the time of Cranmer down to that of Bishop Juxon (1640). See Watson, pp. 258-259.

[58] P. 258.

Even after the edition of 1574 changes appear in the text. In 1732, Dr. John Ward, one of the Gresham professors, overhauled the book to the best of his ability. According to Nichols, he "was employed by the booksellers, who were patentees for printing Lily's *Grammar* of the Latin tongue, to give a correct edition of it, purged of the numerous errors which had crept into all the former."[59] The preface which Ward wrote on this occasion is one of the principal sources for our knowledge of the early history of the Grammar.

A few years later another change was made in the book. About 1758 it was "transformed and appropriated" by Eton College, and became known as the Eton Latin Grammar.[60] Such it remained until the headmastership of Dr. Hornby (1868).

The latest revised edition I have been able to find appeared just ten years before the fateful advent of the new head at Eton. This time the work was recast by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, the less famous brother of the poet; but now it was published under the auspices of Colet's old school, and reclaimed for the use of the boys of Paul's. The title runs as follows: *Rudimenta Grammatices A Johanne Coleto Decano Ecclesiae D. Pauli in Usum Scholae Ab Ipso Institutae. Editio Nova. Londini, Apud Joannem Murray*, 1858.[61] There is a copy at St. Paul's. Though the title is wanting in accuracy, a prefatory epistle admits the share of Erasmus and Lily in the work. This preface, from the scholarly pen of Dr. Herbert Kynaston, Lily's successor in the high mastership, speaks with feeling of the first great Paulines:

Ad Paulinos

Habetis, Pueri, Grammatices libellum a J. Coleto, G. Lilio, D. Erasmo in usum Scholae nostrae excogitatum olim, et in omni parte, ut temporibus illis, absolutum, nunc demum, recudente C. Wordsworth S. T. P. Gymnasii Har-

[59] John Nichols. *Literary Anecdotes*, London, 1812, V, p. 520.

[60] Lupton, in *Notes and Queries*, VI series, II, p. 462, and *DNB* art. "Lily, William."

[61] Re-issues of earlier editions continued to appear, however. The latest I have seen is dated London, 1862, and claims to be the sixteenth edition of its particular type. A copy is in the library of the University of California at Berkeley.

roviensis haud ita pridem Informatore dignissimo, ad accuratioris cujusdam disciplinae exemplar adauctum, accomodatum. Decrevi tamen, consentientibus Procuratoribus nostris, Coleti, Lilii, Erasmi prefationes quasdam apponere, eo potissimum consilio, ut Virorum optimorum beneficia, obsolescentia jam ac prope vetustate obruta, intra hos saltem parietes, ab oblivione hominum et silentio numquam non religiose vindicemus.

H. Kynaston,
D. P. S. Mag. Primarius.

The services of Colet, Lily, and Erasmus, to St. Paul's are not forgotten, even outside her walls; but the grammar they all had a share in compiling has been finally displaced—even though it is still the only authorized grammar in England.

Dr. Kynaston had struck a lofty note; he could hardly have realized that he had sung the swan song of Lily's Grammar.